UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,133	11/14/2003	Tsuyoshi Ohyama	09792909-5730	3928

26263 7590 03/13/2007
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER	
SCHECHTER, ANDREW M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2871	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,133	OHYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Schechter	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8-10,18-20 and 23-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *8-10 and 23-45* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 February 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 24 November 2006 and 29 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues [p. 8] that *Roosendaal* is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102, since it has a US filing date of 26 August 2002, which is after the filing date of Japanese Application No. 2002-049163. This is not persuasive. First, the examiner acknowledges the receipt of a certified translation of this document on 29 December 2006, but notes that no certified copy of the actual document has been filed. Second, in the oath, the applicant explicitly does not claim foreign priority to JP '163 under 35 USC 119 [such a claim is not possible, due to JP '163 being filed more than a year prior to the US filing date]. Therefore, the rejections over *Roosendaal* cannot be overcome by a claim to foreign priority under 35 USC 119.

It appears that it might be possible for the applicant to file an affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131, citing JP '163 in order to swear behind the *Roosendaal* reference; in this case, the content of the JP '163 reference would appear to support the presently claimed invention and would be evidence of conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference. However, such an affidavit would also need to show due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application. There is presently no evidence in the record to establish such due

diligence. *Roosendaal* therefore remains a proper reference and the previous rejections are repeated below.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roosendaal et al.,* U.S. Patent No. 6,731,360.

Roosendaal discloses [see Fig. 1, for instance] a method of manufacturing a liquid crystal display which has a pair of substrates [inherent] and a liquid crystal layer [12] interposed between the substrates and which has a reflective area [on left] and a transmissive area [on right], the method comprising the steps of forming a retardation film [16a] on at least one of the substrates, and patterning the retardation film such that the retardation film remains at least in the reflective area and the phase difference of the retardation film differs between the reflective area and the transmissive area [col. 5, lines 22-26, etc.]. *Roosendaal* does not (perhaps) explicitly disclose that an alignment

film is formed on at least one of the substrates and the retardation film is formed on the alignment film.

However, *Roosendaal* does disclose manufacturing the patterned quarterwave foil by photo-polymerization of a reactive liquid crystal material, and states that "[these] materials get their orientation from thin polymer alignment films; similar to those used to orientate a liquid crystal layer" [col. 6, lines 4-8]. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form an alignment layer between the substrate and the retardation film in *Roosendaal*, motivated by *Roosendaal's* teaching that this is the means by which the retardation film gets its orientation. Claim 18 is therefore unpatentable.

The retardation film is composed of a liquid crystal polymer [col. 6, lines 4-8], so claim 19 is also unpatentable.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roosendaal et al.,* U.S. Patent No. 6,731,360 in view of *Kubota et al.,* U.S. Patent No. 6,771,334 and *Kitagawa et al.,* U.S. Patent No. 6,404,469.

Roosendaal does not disclose that the liquid crystal polymer is obtained by curing an ultraviolet-curable liquid crystal monomer in a nematic phase. *Kubota* discloses an analogous device and teaches that the retardation film with differing regions can be obtained by curing a "UV crosslinking liquid crystal polymer" [col. 10, lines 34-40]. *Kubota* is silent on the nematic phase limitation; *Kitagawa* discloses such a compensator in a nematic phase [col. 3, lines 6-17]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the retardation layer a

liquid crystal polymer of such a composition (UV curable material) in a nematic phase, motivated by *Kitagawa's* teaching that the production process for such sheets is known and they are commercially available (reducing uncertainties and experimentation in manufacturing), and *Kubota's* and *Kitagawa's* teaching that they allow control of optical characteristics including retardation. Claim 20 is therefore unpatentable.

Election/Restrictions

6. Claims 8-10 and 23-45 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 4 August 2005.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Schechter whose telephone number is (571) 272-2302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Schechter
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800
5 March 2007